

REMARKS

In the foregoing amendments, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of former dependent claim 18, which the Examiner deemed to contain allowable subject matter. In addition, claim 14 has been rewritten in independent form. The Examiner has also indicated claim 14 contains allowable subject matter.

And, claim 26 has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 26 is patentable over the applied prior art for the reasons set forth below.

In addition to the amendments discussed above, several of the dependent claims have been rewritten to place them in multiple dependent form, and amendments have been further made to remove ranges within a range and the term "and/or".

Claim 26 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2 302 092A hereinafter GB '092, in view of GB 1 485 388A, hereinafter GB '388. As originally presented to the Examiner, claim 26 depended from independent claim 1. Although the Examiner has provided an analysis concerning the rejection of claim 1, the outstanding Official Action is silent with regard to the subject matter of claim 26.

Applicants submit that claim 26, as now presented, requires that at least part of the stabilizing additive is added by post-blending. It has been found that by incorporating at least part of the additive by post-blending, significantly less additive will be required to achieve equivalent or even superior stabilizing activity. See page 10, lines 14-17 of the present application. The Examiner's attention is directed to the examples of the present application, wherein in example 4, the additive is incorporated into the base powder before extrusion in

an amount of 28 weight percent (300 grams in 1051 grams), while in the other examples, the additive is incorporated by post-blending in an amount up at most 6 percent weight, and often between 0.5 and 3 percent weight.

In GB '092, the preparation of the coating composition is described at page 11, last paragraph, through page 12, third paragraph. Both processes described therein consist essentially of combining all components of the coating composition, melting the mixture, and stabilizing the molten material. Thus, the possibility of adding the additive by post-blending and the associated advantages are neither disclosed nor suggested in GB '092. The secondary reference cited by the Examiner, GB '388, does not describe the addition of stabilizing additives at all, so it does not overcome the deficiency of GB '092. Accordingly, claim 26 is allowable.

The remaining claims are dependent claims that dependent from either 1, 14, or 26, and which are thus allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims from which they depend.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this Response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: March 3, 2004

By: William C. Rowland
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620